The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

UNITED STATES SECURITY ASSISTANCE: COLD WAR RELIC OR RELEVANT IN THE 21ST CENTURY

BY

COLONEL RONALD L. PERRY United States Army

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:

Approved for public release. Distribution is unlimited.



USAWC CLASS OF 2000

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED &

20000519 045

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

UNITED STATES SECURITY ASSISTANCE: COLD WAR RELIC OR RELEVANT IN THE 21ST CENTURY

by

Colonel Ronald L. Perry Infantry

Commander Robert O. Kedney, Jr. Project Advisor

The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the U.S. Government, the Department of Defense, or any of its agencies.

U.S. Army War College CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

> DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A: Approved for public release. Distribution is unlimited.

ii

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR:

Colonel Ronald L. Perry

TITLE:

United States Security Assistance: Cold War Relic or Relevant in the 21st Century

FORMAT:

Strategy Research Project

DATE:

10 April 2000

PAGES: 27

CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The United States Government spends approximately twenty-seven billion dollars per year on what is known as security assistance. This substantial amount of money is to aid developing countries and new democracies, assist established nations, and bolster our current and future allies. It is not a loan; in fact, it is seen as an investment in the future of the world as the United States wants to see that world. This paper will examine the benefits of this investment to the United States Government through the support we receive from these nations in the United Nations. Is the benevolence of the United States to these countries paying dividends in the only world body where the future of the world is shaped, the United Nations? Since the express purpose of our security assistance policy is as stated above and not to end disease, famine, and hunger, or build up foreign armies and national infrastructure, are we getting what we pay for? Or, are we not reaping the influence we desire from this policy? This paper examines the dollars given to each country against the voting coincidence with the United States in the United Nations and makes conclusions regarding the above questions.

ίv

•

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACTIII
TABLE OF CONTENTSV
UNITED STATES SECURITY ASSISTANCE: COLD WAR RELIC OR RELEVANT IN THE 21 ST CENTURY1
AFRICA3
NEAR EAST4
SOUTH ASIA6
EAST ASIA AND THE PACIFIC7
EUROPE8
NEW INDEPENDENT STATES9
WESTERN HEMISPHERE10
WORLD-WIDE UNITED STATES SECURITY ASSISTANCE11
CONCLUSION11
ENDNOTES13
BIBLIOGRAPHY15

vi

UNITED STATES SECURITY ASSISTANCE: COLD WAR RELIC OR RELEVANT IN THE 21ST CENTURY

The United States Government has used security assistance as a major element of our foreign policy since World War II. The primary purpose of this policy was to combat the Soviet Union in the Cold War Era. That era is now over. We live in the Post Cold War world; yet, the United States has not adjusted its policy regarding the use of security assistance to virtually all nations of the world. The United States must begin to look in depth at this policy and apply a cost-benefit analysis approach to determine if we are getting what we expect from this very substantial investment. In analyzing the voting coincidence with the United States in the United Nations the answer is that we are not getting the support we expect.

What is security assistance? How has the United States used security assistance in the past, currently, and how should it be used in the future? In other words, what is the United States security assistance policy, and has it or should it change in this Post Cold War world? These are the questions that this paper will begin to answer. I believe that beginning to understand this very complex and expensive subject is key to determining its future worth to the United States and its foreign policy.

The history of nations providing assistance to foreign governments can be traced to the earliest recorded history. Indeed, in the United States it has been a matter of debate since our birth as a nation. In fact, the United States may not have been born without the assistance from France and Germany during our revolution. After the American Revolution and two terms as president, General George Washington warned of involvement in foreign entanglements or affairs. He did so because he knew that this new and growing country needed time to establish its government and place in the world. In general, successive leaders followed General Washington's sage advice until about the turn of the century. The Spanish-American War, followed closely by the United States involvement in World War I, changed our national outlook. While the United States were yet to become a superpower, we were beginning to be considered a regional power and a major world player not to be left out in the future. Yet, we continued to decline foreign entanglements for the most part. However, this changed after World War II. The United States quickly replaced Great Britain on the world stage and found itself, along with the Soviet Union, to be world leaders and classified as superpowers. Facing this bi-polar world and an adversary of enormous power and influence, the United States began to shape the globe for democracy to counter the Soviet Union's attempt to spread communism world wide. Our foreign assistance program began to grow in scope and dollars and continued this growth throughout the fifties, sixties, seventies and into the eighties. Some years and even some decades were larger than others, but, by degree, the program was massive during the cold war years.

In 1989, what many had hoped for, but never thought would happen, did happen. The United States won the Cold War. The Berlin Wall came down, the Soviet Union disintegrated, and the United States stood alone as the world's only super power. Our economy was flourishing, and yet the world cried out for more and more leadership and assistance from the sole remaining superpower. Throughout the decade of the nineties the United States has had reductions in defense and foreign assistance

spending. Indeed, there are many in the government that long for the isolationism of our early history. During the cold war years much of our assistance to the less fortunate nations of the world was in the form of economic assistance. This economic assistance allowed many fledgling countries to focus their internal efforts on homeland defense while assured by the United States foreign aid of a solid economy. In fact, the assurance of economic aid was based on the receiving nations pledge to resist communism and communist aggression within their borders. Clearly, the end we sought was a democratic world by way of security assistance.

Again, what exactly, is security assistance? Surprisingly, most people, even military personnel do not understand what security assistance entails. Most would think that it is the use of all elements and instruments of our national power to ensure the security of the nation. It is not; it is much less. Simply put, it is the "transfer of defense articles, defense services, military training, and economic assistance..."

This more than anything, describes what security assistance does. Legally, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, provides the most comprehensive definition of security assistance,

- "(A) assistance under chapter 3 (military assistance) or chapter 4 (economic support fund) or chapter 5 (military education and training) or chapter 6 (peacekeeping operations) or chapter 8 (anti-terrorism assistance) of this part;
- (B) sales of defense articles or services, extensions of credits (including participation in credits), and guarantees of loans under the Arms Export Control Act; or
- (C) any license in effect with respect to the export of defense articles or defense services to or for the armed forces, police, intelligence, or other internal security forces of a foreign country under section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act."²

Security Assistance is a complex program made up of the following major entities;

- (1) The Foreign Military Financing Program (FMFP)
- (2) The Economic Support Fund (ESF)
- (3) The International Military Education and Training Fund (IMET)
- (4) The Peacekeeping Operations Fund (PKO)

Within each of the above major categories are numerous sub-funds, programs, grants, credits, loans, and sales that make up the huge Foreign Operations Budget.

The stated policy of the United States in its international or foreign affairs is best put by Secretary of State, Madeline K. Albright, in her 1998 address to the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee. "We must help other nations find their way into the system as partners-by lending a hand to those struggling to build democracy, emerge from poverty or recover from conflict. We must build new institutions and adapt old ones to master the demands of the world not as it has been, but as it is and will be."

The United States Government security assistance policy is grounded in two statutes/laws; the Foreign Assistance Act (FAA) of 1961, as amended and the Arms Export Control Act (AECA) of 1976, as

amended. Both of these acts are amended each year by the United States Congress in the Security Assistance Authorization act, formally known as, The International Security Assistance Act of (year).

The United States Government, or rather, the American people, provide more than twenty-seven billion dollars per year to more than 130 countries around the globe. The United States Department of State administers this assistance to the following regions of the world; Africa, the Near East, South Asia, East Asia and the Pacific, Europe, the New Independent States of Europe (mostly the former Soviet Union), and the Western Hemisphere. Additionally, the Department of State administers Multi-Lateral Security Assistance, Bi-Lateral Security Assistance, and International Security Assistance which are not country specific but regionally specific, and in many cases in support of United Nations programs. The following analysis of each of these regions and programs will be informative and instructional concerning the United States dollars to each over the last three years, including Fiscal Year 2000 and the voting coincidence with the United States in the United Nations over the past ten years.

AFRICA

The continent of Africa claims the second largest United States Government security assistance budget. Only the Near East Region, with Israel and Egypt, receives more assistance from the United States Government. The forty-five countries of the African continent receive approximately 1.3 billion in United States security assistance each year. In addition to this country specific aid, another 285 million dollars, on average, is spent in this region annually. Interestingly, of these two figures, approximately 142 million United States dollars are spent on health related issues each year, more than any other region of the world. The 285 million dollars of non-country specific aid is diverse in scope but directed at specific problems on the continent of Africa. For the last three years, including fiscal year 2000, the average break out for these millions of dollars is as follows;

The African Crisis Response Initiative-20 Million

The African Regional Democracy Fund-10 Million

African Regional Peacekeeping Fund-8 Million

The Countries in Transition Fund-28 Million (new for Fiscal Year 2000)

The Education for Democracy and Development Initiative-29 Million (45 Million in Fiscal Year 2000)

The Great Lakes Justice Initiative-15 Million

The Great Horn of Africa Initiative-15 Million

The Initiative for Southern Africa-28 Million

The Partnership for Economic Growth and Opportunity in Africa-31 Million

The Regional Development Fund for Africa-122 Million

There are five other funds that average from one to five million dollars per year. Among these five is a new fund for fiscal year 2000 called the Safe Skies for Africa Initiative, funded at two million dollars in fiscal year 2000.⁵ This provides insight into the aims of the United States Government security assistance program for the African continent. It, however, is important to see a sampling of the program,

country by country, for the past three years, with the voting coincidence in the United Nations with the United States. The top five countries in the African program, by United States dollars received are listed below;

COUNTRY	FY 00 DOLLARS	VOTING COINCIDENCE WITH USA
Ethiopia	83.8m	32.1%
Mozambique	70.5m	34.5%
South Africa	68.8m	39.7%
Uganda	63.7m	45.2%
Ghana	60.8m ⁶	32.8% ⁷

Most certainly this 1.3 billion United States dollars, on average, per year, provides a degree of security and aid to these forty-five countries. The plight of the African people is widely reported, and most Americans feel sorrow for the underprivileged of this continent. Their lack of adequate education facilities, teachers, high infant mortality rates, and even higher disease rates, including the Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS) are horrific and terrifying to the Western world. If our return for this substantial investment in Africa is a sense of accomplishment and a good feeling about helping humanity. then, perhaps that is enough. If, however, we are expecting a modicum of support from these African governments for United States policies worldwide and our proposals in the United Nations, then, the American people will be sadly disappointed. This group of forty-five African nations has a voting coincidence (a yes vote when the US votes yes, and a no vote when the US votes no) of 34.5%. As can be seen in the listing above, the top five countries in this region garner 347.6 million dollars per year, on average. They vote with the United States slightly better than the regional average at 36.8% of the time. The bottom five countries, receiving only about 4.0 million dollars per year, vote with the United States only slightly better at 38.3% of the time. Yes, we, the United States are doing good and noble things in Africa. The data proves that money will not buy support for United States' policies, which, we believe will make the world a better, more safe and secure place. The policy of shaping and engaging evidently cost more than 1.3 billion dollars in Africa.

NEAR EAST

This region of the world receives the largest portion, by far, of United States security assistance, primarily because of the assistance given to two nations, Israel and Egypt. The Near East region receives, on average, 5.3 billion dollars per year in country specific assistance. Additionally the United States funds nine other non-country specific programs that have totaled as high as 1.7 billion dollars. These programs and the average over the last three years are listed below:

Iraqi Opposition Program-6 Million
Multi-National Force and Observers-16 Million
Israel/Lebanon Monitoring Group-1 Million
Middle East Multilateral Working Groups-3.5 Million
Middle East Regional Cooperation-8 Million

Middle East Regional Democracy Fund-4 Million

U.S./North Africa Partnership-5 Million

West Bank and Gaza Fund-92 Million

Wye Peace Process-900 Million in FY 99 and 500 Million in FY 00

The grand total for the Near East Region in fiscal year 1998 was 5.5 billion, in fiscal year 1999 it was 7.1 billion, and for fiscal year 2000 it is 5.9 billion dollars. Within these totals over 25 million dollars per year, on average, is programmed specifically for health related issues in the region. The enormity of the United States support to Israel and Egypt is unsurpassed anywhere in the world. In fiscal year 2000 Israel is programmed to receive 2.9 billion dollars and Egypt, 2.0 billion dollars. The next highest program in the Near East is Jordan, funded at 239 million dollars in fiscal year 2000. This kind of support to a region should prove beneficial to the United States, but it doesn't. This region, excluding Israel, only votes with the United States approximately 31% of the time. The reason is apparent even to the layman. The United States is virtually the sole supporter of the state of Israel. The Arab countries of the region, even though they are happy to accept the United States dollars, do not support United States efforts in the United Nations because of Israel. Israel, on the other hand, votes with the United States 95% of the time. The listing below will show the top five countries in United States dollars received for fiscal year 2000 and their voting coincidence with the United States for the last ten years.

COUNTRY	FY 00 DOLLARS	VOTING COINCIDENCE WITH USA
Egypt	2.0 b	31%
Jordan	239 m	28%
Lebanon	55m	21%
Morocco	22m	35%
Tunisia	9m ⁹	34% ¹⁰

The bottom four countries in this region receive 27.9 million United States dollars per year, on average, and have a 32% voting coincidence with the United States in the United Nations. The effort in this region is to maintain a balance of power between Israel and Egypt and has been for decades. The question is, in the post cold war world, is this substantial investment for the meager return in support for United States policies, except for Israel, worth it? Could the United States guarantee the security of the State of Israel with a simple policy that an attack on Israel is an attack on the United States? A guarantee that the United States would bring its considerable military might to the aid of Israel, thereby saving for the American people five billion dollars a year. Is Egypt still the regional Arab leader in the Post Cold War world, or is it now Saudi Arabia, who certainly doesn't need United States aid? Is the steady, middle of the road support of Jordan worth nearly 250 million United States dollars per year, when Jordan is not a military power in the region? Is the United States simply buying allies? Is Israel really as important to the United States now that the Soviet Union has been in the grave for more than a decade? It is time, for the sake of the American taxpayer, to rethink this region. Once this is done, I believe the United States can apply a considerable amount of this five billion dollars to issues at home.

SOUTH ASIA

The region of South Asia is made up of seven countries, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka. This region receives approximately 351 million United States dollars per year, on average. There are two programs for the South Asia region that are not country specific, the South Asia Regional Democracy Fund, funded at 8.8 million dollars in fiscal year 2000 and the South Asia Regional Programs Initiative, funded at 59.3 million dollars for fiscal year 2000. Both of these programs are funded at much higher levels in fiscal year 2000 than in the previous two fiscal years. Note also that of this 351 million per year, approximately 48 million per year is spent on programs directly related to health care in the South Asia region. ¹¹ The listing below depicts the entire program for South Asia including the voting coincidence with the United States in the United Nations.

COUNTRY	FY OO DOLLARS	VOTING COINCIDENCE WITH USA
Afghanistan	2.4 m	41%
Bangladesh	87.5 m	35%
India	141.7 m	19%
Maldives	.1 m	35%
Nepal	30.8 m	33%
Pakistan	13.5 m	25%
Sri Lanka	6.9 m ¹²	32% ¹³

It is readily apparent that the country receiving the most assistance from the United States Government is, by far, the least supportive of United States policies in the United Nations. So, what is the United States getting for this investment of almost 142 million dollars per year? Certainly not support for United States efforts across the globe to bring democracy to the world. In fact, India opposes United States actions more than 80% of the time. Yet, year after year, she reaps the benefits of the benevolence of the United States Government and the American people. Does India deserve this generosity? Obviously the answer is a resounding no! Why then, does the United States continue with this dated policy of supporting and courting Cold War "would-be allies" when the Cold War is over? Why continue to support a country that is courting the Chinese and Russian governments, reportedly for a pact of the most populace countries in the world to counter the United States? This is not a secret. Most major publications in the United States have reported this fact, and it is widely read each week in the military publication, the "Early Bird". Will this money keep India's nuclear weapons in the silos? What about the Pakistani nuclear weapons? Perhaps 13.5 million dollars won't be enough to buy off Pakistan. As it is. the Pakistani government opposes United States action 75% of the time now. Again, this region and the United States policy within the region needs to be studied, in depth, to determine if the policy is working or is it just a drain on the United States treasury and the American taxpayer. Certainly this is a region of the world that needs and deserves humanitarian assistance, we can provide, however, not to the tune of 350 million dollars per year.

EAST ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

The Pacific Rim, many think is a region emerging into among the most important and influential regions of the world. This region with its massive population, its technology and labor pools, is indeed, an important region economically. The United States views these twelve countries with such importance that it pours into the region, on average, 337 million dollars per year. Most of these small countries and island nations don't receive much in the way of United States security assistance. Only Indonesia, the Philippines, Cambodia, Thailand, and Papua New Guinea receive double figures in United States aid. Part of the 337 million dollars in aid is in non-country specific aid programs such as;

East Asia and Pacific Regional Environmental Initiative-10Million

East Asia and Pacific Financial Crisis Initiative-53Million

East Asia and Pacific Regional Democracy Fund-6Million

East Asia and Pacific Regional Security Fund-250Thousand

East Asia and Pacific Regional Women's Initiative-5Million

South Pacific Multilateral Fisheries Treaty-14Million

These programs total, for fiscal year 2000, over 88 million dollars. Additionally, almost ten million dollars of the total package for this region is directed at health care programs for Cambodia. The United States program for this region is the smallest of the entire program. The East Asia and Pacific Region illuminate better than any other region the fact that money alone does not guarantee support or appreciation in the United Nations. Note the disparity between the countries receiving the most in United States assistance and those receiving the least compared to their voting coincidence with the United States below:

COUNTRY	FY 00 DOLLARS	VOTING COINCIDENCE WITH USA
Indonesia	90.0m	32%
Philippines	59.6m	33%
Cambodia	24.9m	No voting record since 1996
Thailand	18.0m	37%
Mongolia	16.1m	37%
Laos	6.6m	20%
Malaysia	5.7m	35%
Papua New Guinea	3.3m	35%
Fiji	1.7m	40%
Solomon Islands	1.3m	48%
Samoa	1.3m	43%
Tonga	1.1m ¹⁵	No voting record ¹⁶

The East Asia and Pacific region supports the United States in the United Nations approximately 37% of the time. The bottom three countries, excluding Tonga, which has no voting record in the United Nations, supports United States initiatives better than 43% of the time. In contrast, the top three countries, excluding Cambodia, which hasn't voted in the United Nations since 1996, supports United States

initiatives approximately 32% of the time. This is an astounding difference considering that the top three countries garner 174.5m to the bottom three's 3.7m.

EUROPE

The European region contains many of the United States allies, countries that were in the middle of the Cold War between the Soviet Union and the United States. While the United States no longer provides assistance to England, France, and Germany as part of the European program, this region does include many North Atlantic Treaty Organization members, some former Soviet Union allies, the Balkans region, the Slavic region, Turkey, and even Ireland/Northern Ireland.

The European region is made up of twenty-one countries that receive, on average, 858 million United States dollars per year. Only three programs are not country specific, but account for almost 150 million dollars in fiscal year 2000. They are:

European Peacekeeping Operations-79Million

European Regional Support Fund-10Million

Support for East European Democracy (SEED)-60Million¹⁷

Interestingly, the European region is the only region that receives no specific United States security assistance directed expressly at health related issues. Of the average 858 million dollars per year, approximately 709 million dollars is directed at specific countries. As one would expect, the support for the United States in the United Nations is higher in the European region that any other, including the Western Hemisphere region. The following listing depicts the top five and bottom five in dollars for fiscal year 2000 and the degree of support for United States policies in the United Nations via voting coincidence for the last ten years, on average:

COUNTRY	FY 00 DOLLARS	VOTING COINCIDENCE WITH USA
Bosnia/Herzegovina	273.0m	No votes
Federal Republic of Yugoslavia	76.8m	No votes
Romania	48.2m	66%
Bulgaria	42.5m	67%
FRY of Macedonia	38.5m	63%
BOTTOM FIVE		
Malta	1.7m	53%
Slovenia	6.5m	66%
Portugal	8.1m	66%
Estonia	8.8m	69%
Latvia	9.1m ¹⁸	70% ¹⁹

A close analysis of this 858 million dollar investment in Europe shows that almost 350 million dollars goes to the United States efforts in rebuilding and keeping the peace in Bosnia/Herzegovina and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. This is a substantial investment in a region of the world that most experts say will

require a long-term commitment to solve the problems. How long before peace takes over the region? Nobody knows for sure. The real question for the United States is how long can it invest 350 million or more dollars into a region with little hope for success? The question of vital United States interest comes into play also. This is a considerable commitment by the United States for an area of the world that is of questionable interest to the American people.

NEW INDEPENDENT STATES

Only the Near East and Africa receive more United States security assistance than these New Independent States of the former Soviet Union. The United States has invested over three billion dollars into this region over the last three years, and for fiscal year 2000, the total is 1.165.9 billion. Of this total program one fund cite, the New Independent States Regional Program is not country specific. This program is funded at 96 million dollars in fiscal year 2000. All of the twelve countries of this region receive funds that are specifically directed at health related issues in the individual country. This health investment in the region totals more than 46 million dollars in fiscal year 2000. These New Independent States support the United States in the United Nations approximately 47% of the time. The listing below shows these countries in order of dollars received for fiscal year 2000 and their voting coincidence with the United States in the United Nations:

COUNTRY	FY 00 DOLLARS	VOTING COINCIDENCE WITH USA
Russia	335m	55%
Ukraine	234m	53%
Georgia	101m	59%
Moldova	81m	No votes
Armenia	79m	47%
Kazakhastan	64m	51%
Uzbekistan	46m	91%
Kyrgyzstan	42m	53%
Azerbaijan	37m	43%
Tajikistan	21m	54%
Turkmenistan	17m	49%
Belarus	13m ²¹	42% ²²

The fact that the old fatherland of the former Soviet Union, Russia, votes with the United States in the United Nations 55% of the time is indeed, remarkable. Certainly, that wasn't the case when the Soviet Union maintained the vote for the majority of this region. Much of the millions of dollars invested in this region, especially Russia, Ukraine, and Georgia, are for dismantling of the nuclear weapons maintained by these new nations. However, the United States must begin to question investment in countries such as Russia which continue to violate international law and seek alliances with China and India to gain a

competitive advantage over the United States. Otherwise, the return on this investment in the region seems to be paying off for the United States, particularly in the general commitment to democracy.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Twenty-seven countries from Mexico through Central America to South America and the Caribbean comprise the United States program in the Western Hemisphere. Only the South Asian region and Europe are funded less that the Western Hemisphere. The Western Hemisphere program is not small, funded at 992 million dollars in fiscal year 2000. Thirteen of the twenty-seven countries have assistance target directly at health related issues. There are three programs that are not country specific for this region: the Administration of Justice Initiative, funded at ten million dollars, the Latin American and Caribbean Regional Development Fund, funded at 58 million dollars for fiscal year 2000, and the Central American Regional Development Fund, funded at twelve million dollars for fiscal year 2000. The Western Hemisphere garners nearly one billion dollars per year. However, it is spread over twenty-seven countries, and the top five money receivers get approximately 420 million of the 992 million dollars. This region, America's backyard, America's neighbors, only support the United States in the United Nations approximately 39% of the time. The list below depicts the disparity between the amount of dollars between the top five countries and the bottom five countries in the region:

COUNTRY	FY 00 DOLLARS	VOTING COINCIDENCE WITH USA
Bolivia	118m	50%
Haiti	116m	38%
Guatemala	79m	46%
Mexico	54m	33%
Columbia	52m	33%
BOTTOM FIVE		
Belize	3m	32%
Surinam	3m	37%
Bahamas	4m	38%
Costa Rica	5m	47%
Guyana	5m ²⁴	33% ²⁵

Between the top and bottom five countries above, it is interesting to note that Nicaragua receives 43 million, Honduras 43 million, Brazil 32 million, El Salvador 49 million, and even Cuba get s about six and a half million dollars per year. This region was once a major ideological battleground between the United States and the Soviet Union. Those days are over. There is no major competitor with the United States in this region, and democracy is beginning to flourish. Is there reason to continue to invest nearly a billion United States taxpayer dollars in the Western Hemisphere?

WORLD-WIDE UNITED STATES SECURITY ASSISTANCE

The United States Multilateral Assistance Program is funded at 3.5 billion dollars in fiscal year 2000 and that has been the average for the last three years. This huge program provides over 230 million dollars per year to at least ten United Nation's initiatives. The major recipients of this assistance are the Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs) at 1.4 billion, the World Bank Group (International Development Association-IDA) at 804 million, the unspecified International Organizations and Programs Fund at 293 million, the Asian Development Bank Fund at 177 million, the Global Environmental Facility at 143 million, the African Developmental Band Fund at 127 million, and UNICEF at 101 million. Without the support of the United States these initiatives would cease to exist.

The United States Bilateral Assistance Program is funded at approximately 4 billion dollars per year. The major recipients of these dollars are as follows:

Assistance for the New Independent States of the Former USSR-1 Billion

Developmental Assistance Fund (unspecified)-780 Million

Child Survival and Diseases Program-555 Million

Developmental Fund for Africa-512 Million

USAID Operating Expenses-508 Million

Support for East European Democracies (SEED)-393 Million

USAID International Disaster Assistance-220 Million

There are duplications in the Bilateral Assistance Program which seem similar to program in regional assistance programs such as, the SEED program, Developmental Fund for Africa, and the Assistance for the New Independent States of the Former USSR. We also see in the Bilateral Assistance program more aid for Africa and money directly related to health issues across the world.

Finally the United States International Security Assistance is a huge program funded at approximately nine billion dollars per year. Of this nine billion approximately 875 million per year is directed at health care issues worldwide. The largest program in this fund is the Foreign Military Financing and Foreign Military Grants Fund at more than 3.3 billion dollars per year. This program is followed closely by the Economic Support Fund at nearly 2.4 billion dollars per year. The Export/Import Bank gets almost 900 thousand dollars per year, and assistance to refugees worldwide is funded at over 800 thousand per year. This huge program funds such other things as the Peace Corps, regional assistance programs, peacekeeping, the environment, narcotics interdiction, and law enforcement programs.

CONCLUSION

"A number of the guiding principles that continue to inform U.S. security policy are the product of an international system whose underpinnings no longer exist. These principles emerged in a world in which state relations were dominated by the military rivalry between the two superpowers and the technological preeminence of the United States went largely unquestioned, and at a time when there was little serious interference in the prerogatives of large powers by less-developed countries. The massive

transformations of the international order in recent years are obviously forcing a reevaluation of emerging security conditions and U.S. policy responses."²⁷

This quote, from an article in the book, "Global Engagement, Cooperation and Security in the 21st Century", published by the Brookings Institute, is exactly what the United States should be doing. Yet, other than across the board reductions in security assistance expenditures, no real reevaluation of policy has been conducted. The world has become accustomed to and in many cases dependent upon United States aid. The security assistance policy can be compared on an international scale with the dependency cause by the United States long public welfare and assistance policies. These policies have been determined to be detrimental to individual aspirations. Therefore, could not the same be said of the United States security assistance policies? United States security assistance could be characterized as an international welfare program, and in some cases, that is exactly what it is and what it accomplishes.

The question must be asked, "are we pursuing the correct policy in handing out twenty-seven billion dollars a year?" The answer is unclear, which means it must be studied. Are we getting a good return on this investment in terms of support for our policies? Clearly the answer to this is no, at least not in the United Nations. Besides the very low support for United States policies in the United Nations, this is indicative of lack of respect for the United States, even when the hand is out to accept United States assistance. Are certain recipients of these funds, potential adversaries, and, are they using United States benevolence against us? The indicators from the United States intelligence community are that this is a fact.

The most important question that must be answered by United States policy makers, after the above questions is, what could a reduction or deletion of some or all of these programs do for the American economy and the American people? How could all or a portion of this twenty-seven billion dollars be used to benefit the American taxpayer? Perhaps health care, social security, interest on the national debt, are all good choices. The point is that the vast majority of this money is wasted, not properly accounted for, and given with nothing required in return. Therefore, nothing is received in return. The United States security assistance policy must be revamped to put dollars where they will do the nation the most good and cut the rest. The savings from this complete audit of the program should be invested in the American market for immediate or later use on programs that will strengthen the United States. The United States will eventually realize that the economic element and instrument of power in the 21st Century may very well have priority over military power. A strong United States, economically, with little or no national debt, will weld unmatched power in the 21st Century.

WORD COUNT: 5453

ENDNOTES

- ¹ Defense Institute of Security Assistance Management, 19th Edition, <u>The Management of Security Assistance</u>, (Washington D. C., 1999), 5
 - ² Ibid., 54
- ³ Defense Institute of Security Assistance Management, 18th Edition, <u>The Management of Security</u> Assistance, (Washington D. C., 1998), 6
- ⁴ Defense Institute of Security Assistance Management, <u>Security Assistance Training Handbook</u> (<u>Overseas</u>), (Washington D. C., 1982), 1-3
- ⁵ The Secretary of State, <u>Congressional Presentation for Foreign Operations</u>, (Washington D. C., 2000).
 - ⁶ Ibid,
- ⁷ The Secretary of State, Report to Congress on Voting Practices in the United Nations, (Washington D. C., 1998), 8-52
- ⁸ The Secretary of State, <u>Congressional Presentation for Foreign Operations</u>, (Washington D. C., 2000),
 - 9 lbid,
- ¹⁰ The Secretary of State, Report to Congress on Voting Practices in the United Nations, (Washington D. C., 1998), 8-52
- ¹¹The Secretary of State, <u>Congressional Presentation for Foreign Operations</u>, (Washington D. C., 2000),
 - 12 Ibid
- ¹³ The Secretary of State, <u>Report to Congress on Voting Practices in the United Nations</u>, (Washington D. C., 1998), 8-52
- ¹⁴ The Secretary of State, <u>Congressional Presentation for Foreign Operations</u>, (Washington D. C., 2000),
 - 15 Ibid.
- ¹⁶The Secretary of State, <u>Report to Congress on Voting Practices in the United Nations</u>, (Washington D. C., 1998), 8-52
- ¹⁷The Secretary of State, <u>Congressional Presentation for Foreign Operations</u>, (Washington D. C., 2000),
 - 18lbid,

- ¹⁹ The Secretary of State, <u>Report to Congress on Voting Practices in the United Nations</u>, (Washington D. C., 1998), 8-52
- ²⁰ The Secretary of State, <u>Congressional Presentation for Foreign Operations</u>, (Washington D. C., 2000),
 - ²¹ Ibid,
- ²² The Secretary of State, <u>Report to Congress on Voting Practices in the United Nations</u>, (Washington D. C.,1998), 8-52
- ²³ The Secretary of State, Congressional Presentation for Foreign Operations, Washington D. C., 2000),
 - ²⁴ Ibid,
- ²⁵ The Secretary of State, <u>Report to Congress on Voting Practices in the United Nations</u>, (Washington D. C., 1998), 8-52
- ²⁶The Secretary of State, <u>Congressional Presentation for Foreign Operations</u>, (Washington D. C., 2000),
- ²⁷ Janne E. Nolan et al, <u>Global Engagement, Cooperation and Security in the 21st Century</u>, (Washington D. C.; The Brookings Institute, 1994), 507

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- "The Management of Security Assistance", <u>Defense Institute of Security Assistance Management 19</u>, (1999).
- "The Management of Security Assistance", <u>Defense Institute of Security Assistance Management 18</u>, (1998).
- "Security Assistance Training Handbook (Overseas)", <u>Defense Institute of Security Assistance</u>
 Management, (1982).
- "Congressional Presentation for Foreign Operations", The Secretary of State, (2000)
- "Report to Congress on Voting Practices in the United Nations", <u>United States Department of State</u>, (1989-1998).
- "Foreign Military Sales. Foreign Military Construction Sales, and Military Assistance Facts", <u>Department of Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Deputy for Financial Management Comptroller</u>, (1998).
- "A National Security Strategy For A New Century", The White House, (1998).
- "Transforming Defense, National Security in the 21st Century", Report of the National Defense Panel, (1997).
- "United States Strategic Plan For International Affairs", The Secretary of State 1st Revision, (1999).
- Huntington, Samuel P. "The Lonely Superpower." Foreign Affairs 78 (March-April 1999).
- Wills, Garry. "Bully of the Free World." Foreign Affairs 78 (March-April 1999).
- Nolan, Janne E., ed. <u>Global Engagement, Cooperation and Security in the 21st Century</u>. Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institute, 1994.